

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: **Florian Bomers**)
Serial No.: **10/699,968**)
Filed: **November 3, 2003**) PATENT PENDING
For: **Universal Computer Input Event**) Examiner: Mr. Sherrod Keaton
Translator) Group Art Unit: 2175
Docket No: **5168-001**) Confirmation No.: 5026
)
)
)
)
)
)

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

transmitted by facsimile on the date shown below to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at (571) 273-8300.

May 22, 2009

Date	Michael D. Murphy
------	-------------------

This correspondence is being:

electronically submitted via EFS-Web

RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF

The Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief (mailed on 5/11/2009) indicated that the Appeal Brief filed on 1/2/2009 was defective because the brief failed to provide a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review. Particularly, the notification indicated that the brief failed to list the grounds of rejection to be reviewed for claims 15, 23, and 24, which are included in the set of appealed claims. Further, the notification stated that it was not necessary to resubmit the entire brief; rather it indicated that resubmission of the defective section would be sufficient. Thus, the below paragraph corrects the noted defect, and replaces Section VI in the filed appeal brief:

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 11-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. 2004/0263477 A1 (hereinafter "Davenport"), in view of U.S. Pub. 2004/0257341 A1 (hereinafter "Bear"). Please note that Item 6 in the Final Office Action of 7/22/2008 fails to include claims 15, 23, and 24 in its listing of rejected claims, but the detailed arguments set forth Davenport/Bear obviousness rejections against them.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davenport and Bear, in further view of U.S. Pub. 2003/0071842 A1 (hereinafter "King").

Claim 23 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claim 23 is further rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Respectfully submitted,

COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.



Michael D. Murphy
Registration No.: 44,958

Dated: May 22, 2009

1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300
Cary, NC 27518

Telephone: (919) 854-1844
Facsimile: (919) 854-2084